



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE ORIENT FOR THE OCCIDENT

---

WILLIAM I. THOMAS  
The University of Chicago

---

The Manchus have a saying: "The man who comes from a strange locality is contemptible; the thing which comes from a strange locality is precious."<sup>1</sup> The Mongols have a saying: "The thigh-bone of an elk cannot be fitted into a saucepan, and a stranger does not jibe with a stranger."<sup>2</sup> And all large groups of men have similar sayings, representing the recognition of a deep-seated sentiment of hostility to outsiders. Strictly speaking this prejudice toward outsiders must be regarded as an organic attitude common not only to mankind but to all animal forms possessing a certain degree of memory, emotion, and gregariousness. This feeling is of course connected with the struggle for life, and is, in fact, primarily based on the instinct of fear.

Gregariousness not only affords objective benefits in the way of solidarity and co-operation, but on the subjective side involves a recognition of likeness between members of the group, and a limitation of affection to those sharing that likeness. The struggle for existence implies a hostile attitude toward the world at large—toward all objects which have not by association and co-operation become a part of the group personality. In a group whose existence depends on its solidarity, signs of solidarity in the way of similar appearance, behavior, and sentiments give a feeling of security, and any unlikeness is a sign of danger. It is not necessarily felt to be such, but genetically it is such.

A group having a common origin and a common history must have to some degree a memory, a consciousness, and a personality in common, and common emotional reactions. In

<sup>1</sup> Rochet, *Sentences, Maximes et Proverbes Mantchoux et Mongols*, p. 62.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 111.

nature war is the rule and peace the exception, and the fear-and-hate attitude of a whole group toward another is merely individual fear and hate writ large.

The unlikeness of a different group is brought to the attention and excites prejudice in two ways: (1) by signs manifested in the bodily habits, and (2) by signs manifested in social habits. The surface signs of unlikeness naturally strike the senses more forcibly, and among these the skin is perhaps the bodily characteristic which most provokes prejudice, because most obvious. Every race is habituated to its own skin and has a warm feeling for its own color, and a different hue excites feelings of distrust, fear, and something akin to rage. Livingstone says:

There must be something in the appearance of white men frightfully repulsive to the unsophisticated natives of Africa; for on entering villages previously unvisited by Europeans, if we met a child coming quietly and unsuspectingly toward us, the moment he raised his eyes and saw the men in "bags," he would take to his heels in an agony of terror, such as we might feel if we met a live Egyptian mummy at the door of the British Museum. Alarmed by the child's wild outcries, the mother rushes out of the hut, but darts back again at the first glimpse of the fearful apparition. Dogs turn tail and scour off in dismay, and hens, abandoning their chickens, fly screaming to the tops of the houses.<sup>3</sup>

An Australian woman had a child by a white man: she smoked it and rubbed it with oil to give it a darker color.<sup>4</sup> The children that are born [in Mabaar] are black enough, but the blacker they be the more they are thought of; wherefore from the day of their birth their parents do rub them every week with oil of sesamé, so that they become as black as devils. Moreover, they make their gods black and their devils white, and the images of their saints they do paint black all over.<sup>5</sup>

In the Malay Archipelago—

the standard of perfection in color is virgin gold, and as a European lover compares the bosom of his mistress to the whiteness of snow, the East Insular lover compares that of his to the yellowness of the precious metal.<sup>6</sup>

With regard to other physical aspects the same law holds.

<sup>3</sup> *The Zambesi and its Tributaries*, p. 181.

<sup>4</sup> Waitz, *Anthropologie der Naturvölker*, English translation, Vol. I, p. 263.

<sup>5</sup> Marco Polo, *The Book of Marco Polo concerning the Kingdoms and Marvels of the East*, Book III, chap. 18.

<sup>6</sup> Crawford, *History of the Indian Archipelago*, Vol. I, p. 23.

Among the Manchu those women are preferred who have the characteristic Manchu form, that is to say a broad face, high cheek-bones, very broad noses, and enormous ears, and the prize beauty is the one on whose face you can set a saucepan without touching her nose.<sup>7</sup>

#### A servant of the king of Cochin China

spoke with contempt of the wife of the English ambassador, that she had white teeth like a dog, and a rosy color like that of potato flowers.<sup>8</sup>

It is well known also that the predilection for group traits is extended to the characteristic dress, to tattooing, scarification, filed or blackened teeth, flattened head, and other voluntary alterations and deformations of the body. Mrs. Gray remarks in this connection :

A Chinese lady looks elegant until she moves, when she loses all grace to our eyes (not though to the Chinese, who consider the gait of a small-footed woman most elegant), as she hobbles about supporting herself on the arm of an attendant.<sup>9</sup>

On the other hand the oriental regards some of our fashions with equal horror: The dress of oriental women is designed to conceal the figure while that of our women is designed to accentuate it.

To an Oriental a corset, which increases the waist line and the plasticity of the figure, is the extreme of indecency—far worse than nudity. It seems like an application of the art of the courtesan to appeal to sensuality.<sup>10</sup>

These skin and other surface prejudices are, however, really in a sense superficial, wearing off with long-continued familiarity. The Egyptian women are slender, and that type is preferred by the men, and the slender form is praised in Egyptian love songs, but the Egyptian who long resides among the corpulent and unctuous black women of Africa comes to prefer their color and their form. Livingstone and Stanley both report in this connec-

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Pallas, in Prichard, *Researches into the Physical History of Mankind*, 4th ed., Vol. IV, p. 519.

<sup>8</sup> Waitz, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 305.

<sup>9</sup> *Fourteen Months in Canton*, p. 51.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Vambery, *Sittenbilder aus dem Morgenlande*, p. 49, quoted by Sumner, *Folkways*, p. 426.

tion that they were much shocked at the cadaverous appearance of whites after a long residence among blacks.<sup>11</sup>

This same degree of preference and prejudice exists in the region of social habits. Aversions in this connection are well illustrated by the food tabus. Food prejudices have no logical basis, but are the result of group usage. Not to speak of our unreasonable aversion to horse and dog flesh, in the face of our consumption of swine, cannibalism, the strongest of all our food tabus, is very superficial in its nature. Those who practice it do so with complete naïveté and those who do not can become accommodated to the practice when circumstances force them to begin it.<sup>12</sup>

One of the most striking features of these race aversions, however, is their violent and uncompromising character under the ordinary run of habit and their rapid and complete conversion into their opposites when some advantage in the way of distinction or security is involved in the new attitude.

The negro loses his prejudice against the white skin in America and seeks to acquire it. Slaves returning to Sierra Leone in 1820 assumed the rôle of whites, even called themselves white, and the natives "bush niggers." The successful activity of the white stimulated them to acquire, if possible, the signs of whiteness. Similarly the Japanese for fifty years have been diligently acquiring our habits, with the view of equaling our activities, and in the degree that they showed ability equal to ours along our own lines we began to have a fellow-feeling for them, and even a very warm admiration. They looked charming to us in their own country, and we were progressing toward social, political, commercial, and matrimonial alliances with them, when the genial currents of our soul were frozen by the discovery that they were dangerous. In our own country they are better fruit growers and farmers than we are and their standard of living is lower. They are therefore a menace, and there begins to be a

<sup>11</sup> Livingstone, *loc. cit.*, p. 379; Stanley, *Through the Dark Continent*, Vol. II, p. 462.

<sup>12</sup> Steinmentz, "Endo-Kannibalismus," *Mittheilungen der anthropologischen Gesellschaft im Wien*, Vol. XXVI, pp. 1 ff.

reinstatement of the hate attitude, especially on our western coast; but it is to be noted that this feeling is now rather a class prejudice, based on economic fear, than the original race prejudice.

It is usually held that the conflict of races is fundamentally economic, and in a proximate sense this is true. The bulk of conflict has always turned on food and on the territory involving the food supply. But it is important to note in the first place, that gregariousness and tribal organization have both been the outgrowth of the fact that food is secured to better advantage in combination than in isolation, and in the second place that in the early forms of society, as in the later, there has always been an eagerness to establish trade connections with outsiders, even when no thought of any other connection was entertained. In many cases trade has been carried on between savage tribes who were unable to overcome their fear and prejudice sufficiently to meet each other, and who secured interchange of commodities either through the mediation of an old woman, or by depositing wares at a given point and leaving them, with an indication of the price. The other party either accepted the proposition and left goods in payment, or left notice of a counter proposition and temporarily retired. In many cases also trade relations were kept up between savage tribes actually at war, it being agreed that traders from either tribe would not be molested. The whole history of the relation of England and China has likewise been a remarkable and almost comic illustration of the fact that two groups instinctively antipathetic may yet feel driven to come into economic relations. The establishment of the "Co-Hong," as a trade intermediary between these two countries and the employment of the old woman as a go-between in savage tribes are, in fact, the same type of mediation. I take it that the whole history of trade is an experiential expression of the fact that wider relations really mean greater security on the food side; and I see no reason either why there should be any limitation to the operation of the principle, under proper control, short of the inclusion of the population of the whole world. The question of economic adjustment is merely a particular phase of the question

of adjustment in general, and this is after all a question of mental conditions. The mind is the organ of adjustment, and it is in conditions of consciousness that we must look both for the origin and the resolution of race conflict.

When we come, then, to examine this question on the side of consciousness, we find that when the mind of the group has a certain degree of homogeneousness there is little tendency to change and little conflict. In animal societies we find a stable equilibrium, because the consciousness is instinctive, representing typical reactions to habitually recurring types of situation. In the family, as it is constituted among ourselves, consciousness is relatively uniform and conflict is reduced to a minimum. Similarly, early tribal society and the half-cultural stages represented by China, and by Japan before her awakening, have a relatively uniform and simple consciousness. The basis of life is habitual, and the traditional stimuli are mandatory. Such peoples are not distinguished by the transmission of a body of scientific knowledge to the younger generation, but by their insistence on certain traditions and forms which are deeply stamped on the character of every individual. Less plasticity and originality are thus secured but greater conformity and solidarity. The population acts as one man, but it is not an intelligent population, because habits of skepticism, dissent, and change are absent. Their solidarity is gained at the expense of plasticity, and is based on the activity of the spinal cord rather than the cerebral cortex. We may suspect indeed that some groups remain stationary primarily because the fixation of habit so essential to groupwise action has been overdone, and the power of change lost.

The scientific and speculative habits which lead to skepticism, dissent, and change are particularly difficult where a people has reached a considerable level of culture, as in the case of the Hindus, the Chinese, and the Jews, where a theocratic or aristocratic form of government tends to consecrate and perpetuate old habits, or where the oral word is reinforced by the written record. Such a people is inclined to associate its grandeur, of

whatever type that may be, with its characteristic habits and to identify its very existence with their perpetuation.

The persistence of the Jews as a peculiar people in the midst of Christian states can be explained only if we have in mind the fact that they have carried with them the extremely formal ritual of the Old Testament and persisted in its practice among a people peculiarly inhospitable to begin with—on account of the association of this race with the death of Jesus. The result is that the Jew has preserved his characteristic forms and his characteristic consciousness, to such a degree that even today, Kosher kitchens are being installed on the great ocean liners. In contrast with this the European peasant, having no great past and anxious to get away from his past whatever it may be, becomes characteristically American in the second generation.

In contrast with the eastern, the western nations have the habit of change. We are the people of the "multiple hypothesis." We have an experimental method in science, with a large body of general ideas, and their application in different practical fields, and we have the historical method, enabling us to see principles behind a mass of details. The white nations are also all well advanced toward the democratic régime, which means at bottom that freedom of action and a reasonable protection in such a course secures more invention in every sense of the word, and a consequent increase in power. With the cortex in control, in the possession of many general and useful scientific notions, and with a premium on invention, we are rapidly increasing our control at least over the inorganic world.

But on the social side we are not doing well. The common consciousness developed in tribal society through the participation of all in enterprises involving common food and common defense, has been destroyed by the enlargement of the group beyond tribal proportions, the differentiation of occupations and the division of labor, we have a divided consciousness. The old instinctive solidarity developed largely through activities of the spinal cord has been broken up and has been only incompletely restored through the operations of the cortex. The human mind is a very precious possession, but it is also a very dangerous one.



Its exercise implies the breaking up of old habits, both those growing out of animal instinct and those established through "folk-thought," and the interval between the disturbance and the reaccommodation is necessarily one of anarchy and *laissez faire*.

There is at present a general disturbance of consciousness and failure of ideals among ourselves, indicated by the manipulation of the many by the few in industrial life, by the failure of many, indeed of most, to command the leisure and the access to copies which would develop their characteristic powers, by the fact that the reproductive life is so little controlled that idiots and imbeciles are increasing at a more rapid rate in some localities than the normal population, while at the same time the half of the population consisting of women is largely excluded from constructive work and given over to the vanities.

That control, indeed, which we have regained in our enlarged society is almost wholly through mechanical aids, and these are applied to the human environment with the precision and ruthlessness which characterizes their application to the inorganic world. We have freed our slaves, recognizing in this that no man is an alien, to be treated as an economic value, as we treat inanimate things. But psychologically speaking our population is still divided into alien classes and the negro is not only still in virtual slavery, but the capitalistic manipulator treats the laborer and the public as inanimate things, possessing only economic value—or is only just beginning not to do so.

It appears, therefore, that our class problem and our race problem are at bottom the same thing, differing only in degree. The disparity in consciousness is greater between races than between classes, and in addition our race-prejudice and tribal arrogance survive and inhibit human reactions toward the oriental and the negro, cutting them out of our system and leaving them completely alien. At the same time the oriental is getting possession of our system or of that part of it which is superior to his own from the standpoint of control, and we begin to feel that our civilization is threatened. Owing to ease of communication a rapid movement of integration is going on,

and while all people will not rapidly become of one blood, they are with the swiftness of thought becoming of one consciousness. In the hands of one alien race white methods are having a more complete and rigid application than we have been able to make of them, and we begin to fear that we have raised a devil which we cannot lay. On the score of hard labor and a low standard of living we cannot compete with the oriental, and the oriental world is large enough to overwhelm us and smite us with a sword which we have put into his hands. And when we reflect that if a world-conflict for racial supremacy arises, all the colored races of the world will inevitably combine against the white, and that the yellow and black races are even now vaguely contemplating such a combination, we may well be affrighted.

I cannot here rehearse the historical relations of the West and the East, but in any comparison of the Orient and Occident we must not disregard the fact that we are in the habit of overestimating our own superiority, and ignoring traits of the oriental which have value either from his standpoint or in point of fact. We have a passion for change, the oriental has a profound respect for permanence.

China is one of the oldest and most respectable nations in the world. Her moral and social systems are in some points superior to our own. She is inclined to peace and is the mother of useful arts. Her people are the most industrious in the world and feel least the irksomeness of labor. What superiority we possess over them we owe to the habit of looking for the general law behind particular details, a trick which we caught from the Greeks, who perhaps themselves caught it from Asia, and bettered the instruction. Our advancement is slight, except in the development of a control of nature. In the slums of our great cities and in the lot of our very poor we present a spectacle more unrelieved of misery than can be found in China or perhaps in the whole world. Historically also our demonstrations toward China have been both so good and so bad, and withal so inconsistent, that her attitude toward us has necessarily remained suspicious and hostile. The operations of General Gor-

don in suppressing the Tai-ping rebellion certainly gave her a profound impression of power and justice, but must at the same time have excited her fears; while our magnanimity in connection with the famine of 1878 was more than offset by our action in forcing her to continue the opium traffic, our seizure of her territory, and our exclusion of her citizens.

From the standpoint of China we are an upstart, bullying an older and dignified nation. She loves peace, but she is obliged to prepare for war. We have hectored her until like an elderly and retiring citizen beset by young Hooligans she is reluctantly arming herself. That Christian civilization should force a great and peaceful people to devote its resources to the imitation of our hideous preparation for war is a mockery and a debauchery, and that is the view the Chinese take of it.

The case of Japan is different. She was not debauched, at least not in the fighting line. She went on a spree in the 80's and adopted the French corset, the code Napoleon (the latter with modifications), and other European habits which did not represent the genius of her national life, but it was only a spree, and she is coming to her senses. On the fighting side Japan has had a history very similar to that of Europe. She had the same feudalism, the same wars between great houses, and a system of Bushido closely resembling the fighting side of our chivalry, but of so finished and exquisite detail that chivalry looks coarse beside it. Moreover Japan is young, almost as young as we are, and her habits were more broken up in course of the historical changes through which she had passed. Her modernity enabled her to see the advantage of our science and firearms. When Commodore Perry made a demonstration of them she said on the spot: "We must have them." She was already the fighting cock of the Far East and was easily lessoned in the fighting line. No nation indeed ever accepts anything from another unless it is ready for it. A jump from savagery to civilization would be like a jump from arithmetic to calculus, and could not be made. Japan was ready and waiting. The colony is always more ready to change than the mother country—the very fact of movement in space and the new accommodations

involved set up a habit of change—and both Europeans and Japanese are, I take it, colonists from Asia.

At the same time Japan has a juster appreciation of the elements of grandeur in Chinese civilization than we have and is actually deriving her moral and aesthetic stimulations from China, or is beginning to turn back to China and away from us. China is the Greece of Japan.

In spite of all this, we have the grand advantage of being in possession of general ideas and of the habit of developing general ideas, and these are the secret of progress.

While we are working under strain, I cannot think that we are in danger of making a failure. Psychology teaches us that what a situation dominated by habit or by inadequate ideas needs is shock; and this, at any rate, is coming from the Orient. The mind is never inclined to work up to the limit of its capacity unless a strain is thrown on the attention through the failure of old habits to work satisfactorily; and it is probable that in connection with the disturbance of western habits by pressure from the East, stimulation will not only be provided for a recommendation which will avert catastrophe in that direction but also for a radical revision of our western civilization.

Human progress seems much to resemble the principle of change of type called by De Vries mutation. Contrary to the old theory held by Linnaeus, that nature never makes a leap, De Vries holds that specific changes in nature are always by leaps. In human society also some crisis or incident—the emergence of a great man, of a new mechanical force, of an idea like liberty, the discovery of a new continent or the impingement of one group upon another—causes a new focusing of attention, new directions of energy, new strains, new ideas, and a leap in progress. The history of mankind shows also that a large group is favorable to progress. Invention in mental life corresponds to variation in nature, and in both cases change is favored if the scale of operations is enlarged. Isolation not only does not provide the proper stimulation and suggestion, but results in a hardening of habits and

aversion to change. With every extension of intercourse—as in the case of the contact of central Europe with Greece and the addition of America to the old world—there follows a change of pace and of copies. But America and Europe, Europe and Greece, represent essentially the same type of life, and the younger group has had no stimulation to depart from the copies of the old. The contact of Orient and Occident means a world-wide enlargement of environment, richer not only in the raw stuffs for new social and mental constructs, but in the stimulations to work out these constructs. On the theory of probabilities, the vast population of China and the fresh and brilliant minds of the Mikado's empire, unprepossessed by western habits, and their vision unobscured by western blind-spots, but possessed of western ideas and equipped with western standpoint, will contribute materials which will tend at once to unify and to enrich our common consciousness.

"There is that scattereth and yet increaseth." Ideas tend to disturb habits, but it is ideas which again establish habits of a larger content. The failure of a group to progress is due to the failure of crises to break up old habits, and the decadence of a group which has once made progress is due to the failure to produce ideas rapidly enough or to disseminate them widely enough to accommodate to the strain introduced through internal change or external shock. The downfall of the Roman Empire, for instance, is popularly attributed to luxury, but was it not rather due to the fact that the means of communication, especially printing, were not developed to the point of reconstructing the consciousness of the rapidly inflowing barbarian population? We are safe because we have the habit of seeking change. We produce our own crises, and we have the means of communicating the resulting ideas rapidly and universally.

While it is evident that increasing communication between the white and yellow races means more strains, new accommodations, new ideas, a fuller and richer consciousness, and a more rational control, it is, I think, impossible to predict the precise steps which will be taken in further development, or the order in which these steps will be taken.

We have, however, a general indication of the method of progress in the history of general ideas, and in the fact that a people may become dominated by useful ideas almost to the point of mania, and to the exclusion of non-useful or harmful interests. The Germans became obsessed by the idea of research early in the last century, and their results have contributed incalculably to the increase of rational control. The newest branch of sociology, eugenics or conscious race-culture, has possibilities of race amelioration second, perhaps, to no other single science, if only it can once possess the minds of men, push out the flimsy, tawdry, formal, and ostentatious ideals of society life, inspire the world with the idea of children untainted alike in body and mind, and purify the race by the elimination of the insane, the idiotic, the diseased from birth or from excess, and the habitual criminal.

And if also the ideas implied in eugenics come to the front and touch our imaginations, the production of new, beautiful, and superior types by the mixture of races will be watched with scientific interest and even with artistic enthusiasm. From this point of view race differences will become a trait of attraction rather than repulsion, and all sentiments about the life or death of any particular group will fade out of the feelings. Or rather, our prepossessions and repugnances will be constantly reforming with different contents, but with that degree of openmindedness which characterizes our adhesion to and dissent from scientific theories. For I myself do not look for the elimination of personal, sectional, and racial difference in type and feeling, nor do I think such a consummation a thing to be wished. Variety is itself a delight. Difference, dissent, and conflict answer to our psychological make-up and are bound up with our stimulations. But that degree of consciousness of kind represented by advocates at law who "fight manfully and eat and drink as friends" will leave our emotions running high without rendering us too soft for practical purposes.

Both ethnology and trial by combat have demonstrated that the Oriental is not our inferior by endowment, but only by habit. In some respects, indeed, he is not our inferior at all. On the emotional side he is our superior, as we are his superior on

the intellectual side. And from the standpoint of the reconstruction of our own consciousness the yellow races are of far greater immediate significance to us than the black. The black race as a whole is so completely out of our class and has so completely failed to develop any values peculiar to itself that we find it difficult to have intellectual commerce with it, even when it is near at hand. The unlikemindedness of the white and yellow races is very great also but the difference is one of kind, not degree, and culture finds its way across on the same level more easily than it works up and down. I think it is not improbable, therefore, that the yellow peril will not only provide us with stimulation for the reformation of our own consciousness but that the practice work in that connection—the technique of transformation thus developed and the softening of our prejudices—will put us in the way of handling the black question also. I recognize that the great masses of the negro are just above the threshold of the brute in consciousness but I believe this is a defect of copies more than of mental machinery. I am aware also that you cannot hustle the East, and that racial repugnance seems to us to be rooted in our nature almost as deep as appetite itself. But the capacity of the mind and feelings to adjust to changing conditions is almost without limit. To acquire the degree of likemindedness which will secure the pursuit of life under conditions fair to all, will of course require time; but when ideas are once set in the saddle they ride very fast, and while the unification of human consciousness may not be a matter of a few generations, and probably will not be, it may well be accomplished within a period of historical rather than geological time.

---

#### DISCUSSION

PROFESSOR PAUL S. REINSCH, UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

Professor Thomas has taken a view very natural to a man who realizes the intellectual possibilities of a union of the Orient and the West; who sees that through the approach between the oriental and the western civilizations our life will be very much enriched; who feels, as a critical student of our own civilization, its defects, and sees how they may be remedied by what the oriental may have to teach us. I think it is very proper for him to take

this optimistic view in his opening paper; there is certainly great hopefulness in the situation.

But if we are to consider the subject of what conflict stimuli exist, and the existence of which we cannot deny, it is the less pleasant duty of those who are to engage in this discussion to insist more fully on those points of difference by the presence of which the situation is overcast, because, even with this hopeful view of the outcome, the only wise ground to take is to recognize that these great divergences in views and interests do exist and will exist until we have reached a new synthesis of East and West. Now I do not wish to take up by any means a summary or general discussion of these stimuli. I wish simply to refer to one or two of them.

The most evident, the most obvious is, of course, that which we call race prejudice, that cover with which a race surrounds itself unconsciously, or even, in later stages, consciously, for self-protection, and which works such a great injustice in the relations between individual and individual. Now we may consider ourselves tolerably free from race prejudice as against the oriental. But we occasionally meet with it in the most unexpected quarters; so for instance the letters of Lafcadio Hearn show that he felt the deepest antipathy for the Japanese—he, the man who entered most intimately into their psychology, who has portrayed their civilization in the most attractive manner. Professor Thomas spoke of Japan as essentially modern; and from one point of view her rapid progress certainly enables us to speak of Japanese in those terms. But in Hearn's opinion the Japanese race is primitive as the Etruscans, and so distant from us that we cannot understand it. If Lafcadio Hearn could have these feelings of distance with reference to the men among whom he had lived and whom in many ways he admired, we can understand the lack of sympathy among the merchants or traveling men who come into contact or competition with them.

The second stimulus is the lack of space. Think of what it would mean if another great area of China should be reduced to aridity, as has happened in the past. What does it mean to the world today that the Japanese inhabit a land that is small and overpopulated? We know ourselves what it means with respect to our own country. This surplus of population is seeking outlets and is seeking them to a large extent in North and South America. The development of Japanese immigration into South America is extending, and there is a source for future conflict and misunderstanding on account of the Monroe Doctrine which very few have thought of; so that the voyage of our fleet to the Pacific may be looked upon as the declaration of the Monroe Doctrine against Japan as well as its former declaration against Europe.

There are of course many other stimuli for conflict, but the third obvious one is that of commercial and industrial rivalry. In this case the stimulus is very concentrated, and embodied in a small group of men, namely the



oriental merchants; in China, as you know, these merchants are congregated in the extra-territorial ports. Now there was never an organization effected in the world in which conflicts of interest assume a sharper emphasis than the foreign settlements of China, because they are republican in form, and are governed by alien laws, while their denizens insist that the entire force of European and American nations shall stand back of them. When Mr. Taft was at Shanghai he horrified the Europeans by speaking of the sovereign rights of China over Shanghai, because it seemed to involve the admission that China might assume the exercise of that sovereignty at some future day.

---

PRESIDENT CHARLES D. TENNEY, PEI YANG COLLEGE, CHINA

It is hardly fair to ask me to express my undigested opinions after you have listened to so careful and admirable a paper on this subject. You have had pointed out to you the natural causes of the antipathy between the yellow and white races. Of course these are causes that cannot be removed. You know that we white people are called in China the "foreign devils." That term is better translated the "foreign ghosts," because the origin of the term is the uncanny appearance that we present to the Chinese with our light hair and our blue eyes. Occasionally in China you see an albino, and you may be certain that every albino in China has the nickname of "the foreigner."

This of course we cannot get over—the natural antipathy of the people of one race and appearance for those of another. But the great cause of antipathy between the white and yellow races is something that can be removed, and that is mutual ignorance. Now, though I agree with almost everything that Professor Thomas has said to us, I thought that in one section of his paper he did an injustice to the Chinese, when he spoke of their wonderful homogeneity. To an observer, of course, who has not penetrated into the inner life of the Chinese, they seem to be very much alike. But if you get into the actual Chinese life, you realize that there is just as much individuality in the Chinese race as there is in ours. The fact is that the Chinese development of language has been such as to form an almost insurmountable intellectual barrier between us and them. If you are able to overcome that barrier and enter into the intellectual life of China you find that they are a people who have their poetry, their philosophy, their history, that their scholars are critical in their examination of historical records, that they delight in the same sort of literary criticism and discussion that we do; but it is on a plane that we cannot easily attain to. They have developed a literature which is so totally different from anything that we are familiar with, that we cannot appreciate it without very thorough preparation.

Now ignorance on both sides is the principal cause of hostility. When we first appeared on the shores of China the Chinese regarded us as a race of savages who had no learning and no intellectual laws, but that we represented brute force. They looked upon us as mechanically ingenious savages, and it

was a great surprise to them to find that we could be influenced by considerations of reason. Even to this day, when a European or an American has mastered the language, he finds that the people of the interior express surprise when they find that they can discuss things with him and argue with him and that he can appreciate them. They have thought that we were actuated only by principles of brute force, that we have a will which we wish to enforce upon them, and that we do it by force; but when they find that we can talk about the reasonableness of a thing, they are surprised.

We have never given them credit for their intellectuality, and they have never given us credit for our intellectuality; and my experience in China has been that just as soon as people come on to common ground, either by our acquiring their knowledge or by their acquiring ours, nine-tenths of the antipathy at once disappears. At the present time, as you know, the Chinese race has elected to adopt our modern system of study, in addition, of course, to the study of their own classical literature. All their mentality, up to the present time, has gone into the study of ethics and of their own classical literature. Now that they have begun to study and appreciate the value of science, they are feeling a new sympathy with us.

What we want to guard against is mutual contempt. After all that is much more important in separating the peoples than any differences in the color of their skin. People can come together as friends only upon the basis of mutual respect. I have lived a quarter of a century in China, and I respect the Chinese. I respect their intellectual ability and their attainments in their literature. I recognize in them a thinking mind, and the Chinese are beginning to recognize the same in us.

I feel that we are at the beginning of the most important epoch in human history. The Chinese, representing a quarter of the population of the world, have held aloof from us, and they have now decided to enter into the modern family of nations.

The question is, how are we going to receive them? Professor Thomas has already told us that all the influences of Chinese education and ethical culture tend toward peace and away from war. Even the Chinese written character "wu," military, indicates their estimate of military affairs, for an analysis of the written character shows its meaning to be "to stop the clashing of spears." But, as Professor Thomas has said, they are being forced into a military attitude. Now, we have just reached a point where we are beginning to realize that the principles of our own religion call for peace, that arbitration is better than fighting; and I say we are now at the most important period of human history, because if we admit the Mongolian race on this basis, all the teachings, all the influences of their history would tend to cause them to unite with us cordially upon this new platform of arbitration; but if we are backward in this, the consequences to ourselves are going to be disastrous. We all believe that the real civilization of the world

is linked up with this great question, and if we are able to move forward rapidly enough in our measures for the abolition of war the Chinese will join with us as brothers in the new era of peace.

---

MRS. J. O. UNGER, FORT WAYNE, IND.

The short paper which I am to read has no direct connection with the chief paper of the afternoon, but is rather a contribution to the general subject of race-struggles and their results. It is to represent the views held on this point by Dr. Ludwig Gumplowicz, for many years professor of sociology and political science at the university of Graz, Austria. Living in a country where race-conflicts have always been especially predominant and severe and have shaped its politics to a great extent, he was no doubt led to give more thought to this subject than to any other and arrive at a theory quite his own. Some authorities have claimed for him the honor of being the actual founder of a true science of sociology in so far as he was the first to attempt to explain the origin and evolution of the state on strictly scientific principles, through the action of natural laws. According to him the race-struggle lies at the very foundation of society, is the condition of the origin and development of the state and without it no state, no civilization at all would have been possible. In discussing social conflicts, antagonisms, and struggles between races and nations as well as between social classes, too little attention has perhaps been paid to the constructive value of these conflicts. And yet this is no doubt one of the most important aspects of the subject. Are struggles, conflicts, antagonisms of any kind destructive, degenerative, to be discouraged, or are they constructive, progressive, to be encouraged? There lies the crux of the whole matter. Gumplowicz, as I said before, holds the latter view. Everywhere in nature we have conflict or at least contact of heterogeneous elements endowed with inherent forces, and out of this contact arise new elements, new formations, new states or conditions of things. The formation of a people, a nation, a state, or the *social process* differs in no fundamental way from the other great processes of nature, which were active in the formation of things, the cosmical or sidereal, the chemical, the vegetal, and the animal processes. In all these we have the same constituent features or distinctive characteristics, namely: (1) original heterogeneous elements; (2) a contact, interaction, or conflict between these, due to inherent antagonistic forces, and (3) the production or *creation* of something new which did not exist before. In other words every nature-process is *creative*; creation is not limited to one creative act at the beginning of things, by one supernatural power, it is going on continually all around us; the world is not eternally the same, but forever changing and evolving. And this is as true of society or the social process as of any other phenomenon and process. And one of the means of this evolution, this creative activity, is conflict.

Let us see how this is to be explained more in detail.

Going back in imagination to the very beginning of our geological epoch, we find our globe peopled by innumerable hordes, tribes, or ethnological groups, each one held together by certain syngenetic feelings: blood relationship, customs, language, and religion (as far as these are at all developed), but looking on all the outside groups as something entirely foreign and unrelated, different in all the above-named things, even, perhaps, in appearance; therefore to be feared and shunned, or, if contact cannot be avoided, exterminated and destroyed. These groups are the sociological units. Roaming through an ever-widening territory in their search for food, they must finally clash and, having not as yet risen very high above their animal ancestors, the result is the same as when animals of different species or those of the same species that want the same hunting-ground, clash: a fierce battle ensues, a war of extermination in which the stronger or more cunning or better-equipped group must conquer and the other is destroyed. Probably all races have passed the primitive phase, called cannibalism. We know that some such races survive even today.

Finally, however, we may assume that these clashes became too frequent, the conquered tribes too numerous to be devoured; besides, growing intelligence, sharpened, no doubt, by these struggles and the necessity of superior cunning and strategy, suggests a better use to be made of the bodies and energies of the conquered foe: he can be enslaved and made to work. *And it is now that the real process of the evolution of the state begins.* As long as the conquerors merely turn their victims into food, the procedure is but a continuance of the animal process, but as soon as they are kept alive and turned into slaves with all their fierce energies and primeval passions still burning within them, the process takes on a different face. The energies of the conquered foe must be put to work, and, in order that in some unguarded moment they may not turn against and destroy the conqueror, this work must be continuous and ardent.

Up to this time the activity of the savage had been but temporary and intermittent, just sufficient to produce for him the means of subsistence and rudest shelter, but it had not produced anything of permanent value; but now the necessity arose of finding continuous employment for these new energies, chafing in sullen hatred under the bondage of the conqueror. How the savage was taught to labor is a chapter in the history of humanity which would probably not be very pleasant reading. We may look with admiration and wonder at the relics of ancient history which are left us as proofs of such work, the pyramids of Egypt, the immense temples and palaces of Assyria, Persia, and ancient India, but we seldom realize the amount of suffering, misery, and patient toil, embodied therein, the agony, fear, and horror, under which the habit of steady work, without which no civilization could ever have become possible, were ingrained. But not only was man thus trained

and shaped on the grindstone of terror and toil, but the foundation was also laid of the organization of society, of the whole complex and far-reaching machinery of the future state. To keep the conquered race in subjection and prevent rebellious uprisings, something akin to the later military class had to be created. To make the work of the slaves most effective their labor had to be somewhat specialized; great numbers of overseers, inspectors, and minor officials had to be trained, and thus a hierarchy was gradually developed. The strict military supervision could not be kept up forever; the enforced propinquity, moreover, toned down to some extent the original hatred, and resulted gradually in toleration on both sides; the subject race, after generations of servitude, finally accepts its position as inevitable or even willed by higher powers or deities; an ecclesiastical class, eagerly welcomed and protected by the conquerors, arises to confirm them in this view; the military class, no longer necessary to keep down rebellions to such an extent, but chiefly used to fight outside enemies and conquer new territory, is gradually recruited from the ranks of the subjected, while the conquering race still furnishes the officers; thus distinct classes and ranks are formed; the conquering race constitutes the nobility and all the higher posts of honor and responsibility are given to its representatives. In the struggle for supremacy among themselves members of the ruling class begin to value the support of the subject race and to reward their faithful adherents with positions of trust and honor. The long slavery and enforced labor has gradually accustomed the subject races to work and ingrained in them the habit of continuous labor, they are much less apt to be rebellious, and are in time given much greater freedom. The middle classes, industrial and professional, arise. The strict system of caste which prevailed for a time and still prevails in many countries, kept up by innumerable laws, which gave rise to the whole complicated system of jurisprudence, is gradually mitigated, and the barriers between the classes are more and more removed. Thus a people, a nation, a state is evolved. But the progress of conquest and amalgamation goes on; the once dominant race, made more efficient by its organization and trained militia, spreads its domain farther and farther and grows ever stronger by assimilation. Yet luck is not always with the most progressive. The flush of continuous victory has made them careless and loosened their organization; moreover, the enforced idleness of the leisure classes has made them effeminate; vice and luxury spread; and we have the spectacle of a Roman empire being overthrown by barbarians. However, the organization, the institutions, and laws of the ancient culture are taken over by the conquerors and quickly a new state and nation arises. Thus the process is ever repeated, and civilization rises ever higher. And the nations which today stand at the pinnacle of civilization are those in whom this process has been most frequently repeated, who have gone through the greatest number of amalgamations.

This, in brief, is the history of civilization and evolution of the state through conquest. Must we, then, draw the conclusion, that conflicts, antagonisms, and even bloody wars will always be necessary to insure the further progress of mankind? Gumpłowicz seems almost to hold this view; to his mind history ever repeats itself, because what he calls the "nature-process" remains eternally the same. But in this he is mistaken. Though the nature-process, as Mr. Ward has pointed out,<sup>1</sup> remains the same in form, it does

<sup>1</sup> *American Journal of Sociology*, March, 1905, p. 547.

not remain the same in its essence. The very fact that it is creative prevents that. If something new is continually formed out of existing material and conditions, then it is impossible ever to go back to exactly the same beginning. Progress or evolution is not only relative, as Mr. Gumpłowicz will have it, but absolute. Even if, as some people pretend to believe, the new is inferior to the old (in which belief I do not coincide), it is certainly never the same and cannot be the same. The process is ever carried to a higher plane. Thus while conflicts may always remain necessary, they need not be destructive. Out of the conflicts occasioned by natural emotions and passions grew intelligence and organization. Mind, thus originated, is a new factor in the problem, which did not exist before, and mind will give a new direction to the process. It will recognize that, though necessary and unavoidable under the conditions of low, egotistic intelligence, destructive wars and conflicts are not necessary under a régime of social consciousness and intelligence; that here as elsewhere the natural process, unaided by intelligent foresight, has been wasteful of much that is precious, has expended energies ruthlessly, that can be turned to better account under more intelligent management. It will see, that, just as slavery and the compulsory training of mankind to work were an improvement over cannibalism, so now, after the habit of continuous work has been ingrained into the very constitution of man, freedom of activity will in most cases be superior to enforced labor, and that gradually attractive measures can be substituted for compulsory measures. The conflicts between peoples and nations will be changed more and more into conflicts of ideas, out of which new and broader views will continually arise, until finally an era may be ushered in, in which we shall have peace of arms but the utmost possible contact of mind with mind, the greatest difference of character, capacity, and work, with the greatest unity of purpose and aim.

---

K. ASAKAWA, PH.D., YALE UNIVERSITY

The argument of Professor Thomas' paper seems to be that the Orient is able to give the Occident certain stimuli which will enlarge and enrich the latter's consciousness, and thereby aid the "progress of socialization." As a student of history, I do not feel called upon to comment on so broad a hypothesis. I am mainly interested in the specific stimuli that the Occident

might receive from the Orient, upon which alone the soundness of the writer's argument must rest, and confess that I fail to find them clearly stated in the paper. It seems evident, in the first place, that Professor Thomas' "Orient" does not include either India or all the subtle but profound influences which Indian thought and religion have exercised upon the social life of central and eastern Asiatic nations. I am led to suppose that he confines his attention to the two countries with which America is in the most active relation, namely, China and Japan. My endeavor to infer from the writer's occasional remarks on these two countries the stimuli which they might afford has not been very successful.

Taking China first, I infer that little wholesome stimulus may be expected from the form of her government. Reference is also made to the feelings which China must have received from the treatment she has suffered at the hands of occidental powers. Here it is China, not the Occident, which has felt the stimuli, unless, indeed, the Occident's own reflection upon China's distress may be called a stimulus. Although the industrial habit and the cheap labor of the Chinese and Japanese receive attention, it is not clear how important the writer regards the stimulus of this kind. Perhaps the most important reference to China made in the paper is the idea that her social organization is largely tribal, and her social consciousness is comparatively simple and uniform. I have tried in vain, on these important points, to gather what is meant by "tribal," what sort of uniformity there is in Chinese society, and what stimuli these supposed facts may give to the Occident to its benefit.

In regard to Japan, Professor Thomas admits freely that she is different from China in being more open to social changes. He seeks a partial explanation of this difference in the fact that Japan is a colony from Asia, all colonies being, according to him, more ready to change than the mother-country. Nearly all the more civilized nations on earth, including China and India, not being originally native to their present habitats, one is inclined to ask the writer when a nation ceases to be a colony and becomes a mother-country.

Although Professor Thomas thus admits the existence of some difference between Japan and China, they are both different, he seems to think, from the Occident in several important ways. In the first place, their ["Japan's before her awakening" and China's] social organization is defined as "tribal." Does he use the term in a figurative sense, as he seems to do in connection with the present racial feeling of the Occident? Or, in case of Japan, has he perhaps been misled by the extremely objectionable term "clan" used by many writers in describing the territorial feudal division before 1868? Japan's social organization has seldom been tribal, in the sense of being based upon the blood tie of the whole group or of the larger groups of the nation, except before 645 A. D.

Then Professor Thomas asserts that Japan "before her awakening" possessed, like China, a "relatively uniform and simple consciousness." Aside from the question of simplicity, which is a flexible term, I am embarrassed by the statement, for its literal acceptance would result in confusing a short period with the entire historic age of Japan. The period between 1639 and 1853, during which foreign intercourse was vigorously excluded by the feudal authorities, and in which the elements of foreign culture introduced in previous ages were assimilated into national life, was in many respects an abnormal period. Circumstances had forced her to close her doors, against her will and contrary to her historic habit. In all other periods, the elements of "dissent, skepticism, and change" were never "absent," and have at three different times brought about as thorough changes of the entire social organism as are known in human history.

Professor Thomas also declares: "The white nations are also all well advanced toward democratic freedom," a statement which is perplexing, especially when it is taken in the implied contrast with the oriental governments. With such elements of democracy as were common to "all the white nations" at the time of Japan's "awakening" may favorably be compared the democracy of letters that has prevailed in China for centuries, and the democracy of arms in the Japan of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, as well as the village self-government in the latter country under the Tokugawa and in China.

Again, we are told that the Occident lacks at present "adequate social ideals." Does or did the Orient possess them? What are they, and how may they stimulate the Occident?

I seriously suspect that, although the writer admits some difference between China and Japan, he has not completely freed himself from the dogma that the Orient is a unit, and from the consequent inclination to conceive the Occident and the Orient always in a broad contrast to each other. I hope my suspicion is unfounded. I suppose he went farther than he would, when he said: "The western nations have the habit of change," and, also: "The oriental world is large enough to overwhelm us and smite us with a sword which we have put into its hands." The large Orient is not united, and could not more readily be united than the western powers. Anyone who claims that the East is one should clearly show wherein its nations, in spite of their enormous differences, are the same.

When Professor Thomas referred to the "scientific observation and experiment" of the Occident, I rejoiced to see him approach one of the great things that differentiate Occidental civilization from any of the Oriental civilizations, and hoped he would enlighten us upon the mysterious origin of this momentous factor. He, however, dismisses this superb subject by lightly saying that the scientific method is "a trick which we caught from the Greeks, who perhaps themselves caught it from Asia, and bettered the instruction."



To sum up: I am sorely disappointed that I have not succeeded in finding many specific contents in this otherwise instructive paper. The writer declines to foretell the *how* of the reaction of the Orient upon the Occident, and he has said little more of the *what*. His paper is another example of the difficulty of making general remarks upon historic nations, when one has not time enough to refer to their historic training. On the other hand, a consideration of the more important features of the social evolution of China, and more particularly of Japan, might have greatly helped us to surmise the probable effects upon the Occident of its active relation with the Oriental nations. I conclude by saying that, although I am unable to judge the value of Professor Thomas' main contention, I do hope that he will make another attempt to substantiate it by a specific discussion. He has a magnificent field before him.

---

PROFESSOR ALBERT ERNEST JENKS, UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

While I have purposely sought to place antithetically certain differences between the man of the Far East and the man of the West as I conceive these differences, and, while of necessity, I take my stand with the man of the West, yet I wish to preface my remarks with a statement of my admiration for the oriental man.

Since it is a law of life that man must earn his bread in the sweat of his brow, I greatly admire a people which has learned to toil almost incessantly, with so little friction and complaint and with so much contentment, as has the Chinese, whether in China or out of it.

When I know the unparalleled ravages of tuberculosis among the American people, I turn with hopefulness to China which has bred a human race practically immune to this terrible disease. The Chinaman has become the most perfect human animal for colonization in the world today. With greater safety than any other people the Chinese may be transplanted to the Arctic snows or the reeking heat of the humid equatorial area.

Again I turn with admiration to the Orient—to Japan. Japan has taught the whole world the practicability of modern scientific knowledge in everyday life—the most important lesson the West can learn from the recent Russo-Japanese war.

When we consider the Asiatic continental man as the oriental, and the American and western European as the occidental, there are, it seems to me, three fundamental cultural traits in which the oriental and the occidental have radically differed, and today do greatly differ, and in which conflict stimuli are active in contacts between the two.

First, the oriental is a peaceful, patient, plodding man, with a meditative, spiritual nature. He has given the world most of its domestic animals and staple food plants. He has given the world all of its great religions. The occidental is a thinking, active, belligerent, materialistic man. He has

given the world its incessant pioneering activity, its modern science, its machinery of modern war, and its heretofore undreamed of machinery for and hoards of material wealth.

We may now enlarge our definition of the oriental so as to embrace the Japanese as well as the continental man of Asia, and say:

Second, the oriental is a communistic man, living, struggling, and dying in herds—in the commune of labor, and the family. The occidental is an individualist. It may almost be said that every American private soldier is potentially a general. Representative government, whether monarchical or republican, points to the individualism of the occidental. One who has seen the average American among the average orientals in the Orient knows that two Americans are worth twenty orientals in an emergency—when practical things must be thought instantly and done quickly.

Third, if one may be pardoned an American bull, he may say the future of the oriental has been, and is largely today, behind him. The oriental looks always backward over his shoulder for the nod or frown of his ancestors. He is tightly tied to the past with the gordian knot of custom and tradition. The occidental's future is before him, and he cares little for the customs and traditions of the past. He builds his reputation and his fortune for his children much more than, as the oriental builds, for the family name established generations ago by his ancestors.

There are three additional conflict stimuli active between the occidental and oriental; and we may now understand the term oriental to be broader than used above, so as to include also the Malayan peoples.

The oriental is naturally a dissembler in word and business transactions. The occidental is a man of truth. The oriental's ways are those of indirection and dissimulation. The occidental man is direct and frank. The oriental will tell you that which he thinks you want to hear, without respect to its truth or falsity. The famed honesty and honor of the Chinaman in business transactions with foreigners of his acquaintance is deserved. It may be based on the superior business acumen of the Chinaman who is a much better judge of the western man than the western man is of the Chinaman. Those who know the Chinese best at home, however, tell me that the greatest weakness of the Chinese today is their mutual distrust of one another; and it is founded upon their inherent untrustworthiness. In spite of the famous Bushido of Japan, all men having transient or prolonged business with individuals in Japan know of the business dishonesty of the Japanese.

The oriental is commonly fanatical and intolerant. The occidental is commonly sane, rational, and a lover of justice; in private life he takes the part of the under dog, and the bully has short life with him.

The oriental is commonly an autocrat and an oppressor, and his hand is heavy on the lower classes and the women. The occidental loves his liberty and his democratic institutions, and his ideal is that the will of the

many shall be the will of all. He has the habit of lifting up the unfortunate, and he honors women.

As Professor Thomas has said, the secrets of the West "are getting out" and all the people of the world are rapidly "becoming of one consciousness." Although the conflict resulting from this contact of the West with the East will undoubtedly give the people of the Orient wonderful cultural advance, as such conflict always does, and will tend to break down some of the differences presented above, yet, because of the long-standing, inherent tendency of the Occident to cultural advance, and because of the long-standing, inherent tendency of the Orient to cultural inertia, and, more than all else, because of the unprecedented racial and cultural conflicts in the occidental world, especially in America, and the apparently relative absence of opportunity for such conflict in the Orient, I believe that the Occident will have far into the future the power of discovering new secrets for cultural advance ahead of the oriental world.

---

PROFESSOR W. I. THOMAS, THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

With reference to Mr. Hearn, I think that while two groups have and continue to have so disparate a consciousness, a member of one group would continually feel the presence of the other; but I imagine also, from my reading of Mr. Hearn, that what he had largely in mind was the insupportable etiquette of the Japanese.

With reference to the question of space and the query as to what we should do if another desert area should emerge, I would suggest that we have the new science of eugenics, and we would see if the two don't synchronize. It may be said in this connection that adaptation to new conditions is the function of reason, and my argument was that while we have reason as a tool, we have not really applied it; and I think when we apply it fully we shall be able to handle the oriental situation. It has been my own observation, in attempting to find what was at the bottom of the universal statement that low races cannot count more than five or ten, that always, when they can't count more than five, they haven't more than five to count; and that any race which gets into commercial relations requiring the counting of five hundred thousand will count five hundred thousand. We may settle upon the principle that the mind will act under stimulation, and the question of desert areas will probably bring forth inventiveness.

With reference to Dr. Tenney's remarks, I feel too much interested in them to wish to say anything. But as to the question of homogeneity: I merely meant by that what I understand he would accept: that the matter of ancestral worship and the principles of Confucianism and the devotion of the Chinese to ethics and their classical literature, give them, although divided linguistically into dialects, a certain background in common.

With reference to Mr. Asakawa's remarks I may say in justice to him

that certain portions of my paper I had not written when he received the outline of it. I don't think it could be inferred that I had confused or merged Japan and China in my remarks. Neither did I in the outline sent to him, but I imagine that he imagined that I designed to do that originally, and made his remarks anyway. Mr. Asakawa misses the point of my statement concerning tribal conditions of consciousness. I did not say that Japan is in a tribal condition, but that tribal society and half-cultural societies like China and Japan, are characterized by a relative homogeneity of consciousness. Some of the comments of Mr. Asakawa evidently arise from a misunderstanding of my meaning. My statement that the Orient is large enough to smite us with the sword which we had put into its hands is perhaps rhetorical, *but it is large enough*. As to his question, when does a country become a colony? It becomes a colony just after it leaves the mother country, and if a part of its inhabitants leave it, they also form a colony. I don't question that the Asiatics came from somewhere; I merely remarked that Japan is not in every sense so old as China.

With reference to Mr. Jenk's remarks, which were not devoted to me, I want to say of oriental dissimulation that I understand it does not appear in Chinese business. That is universally, I believe, understood. Certainly I don't think that the love of justice on the part of the Occident has been exhibited in connection with any race, at any time, or anywhere.